

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/814,811	03/31/2004	Philippe Messager	A64.12-0004	5300	
27367	7590 10/13/2005		EXAMINER		
WESTMAN CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.			NGUYEN, HIEP		
2011-1111	- INTERNATIONAL CE DAVENUE SOUTH	ENTRE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	LIS, MN 55402-3319		2816		

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				N
Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)	-Ur
		10/814,811	MESSAGER, PHILIPPE	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Hiep Nguyen	2816	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app r Reply	ears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address	
A SHO WHIC - Exten after 9 - If NO - Failur Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNION (36(a). In no event, however, may a control of the state of t	CATION. eply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a)⊠ 3)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>15 Au</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matt	•	is
Dispositie	on of Claims	·		
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1,3-16 and 21-23 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1,3-16 and 21-23 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.		
Application	on Papers			
10)⊠ 7	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on 31 March 2004 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ obj drawing(s) be held in abeyar ion is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121	(d).
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)⊠ <i>A</i> a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau ee the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in A rity documents have been u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachment	• •	_		
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 2816

ij

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment filed on 08-22-05 has been received and entered in the case. New ground of rejections necessitated by the amendment is set forth below.

Claim Objections

Claims 3, 4 and 6 are objected to because of the following informalities: claims 3, 4 and 6 depend upon cancelled claim 2. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 3-15 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, the recitation "equal to the <u>internal reference voltage</u>, taking into account the <u>reference voltage</u>" is indefinite because it is not clear as to the <u>internal reference voltage</u> is the same or different than <u>the reference voltage</u>". Figure 4 of the present application shows only the reference voltage (3V reference).

Regarding claim 3, the recitation "the currents circulating in the connection means and in the limiting and/or detecting means are <u>balanced</u>" is indefinite because it is not clear what "balanced" is meant by.

Regarding claim 12, the recitation "characterized in that the <u>power</u> of <u>the fourth</u> <u>transistor</u> is <u>less than</u> that of the <u>transistors of the second mirror</u>, so that the latter imposes its level on the <u>fourth transistor</u> when it delivers the copy of the blocking current" is indefinite because it is not clear what is the "fourth transistor" in the drawing and it is not clear what the "power" is meant by. While the specification (page 6, lines 4-8) discloses that "the <u>third</u> transistor has the <u>size</u> smaller than the sizes of <u>the transistors of the second mirror</u>". The same rationale is applied to claim 21.

Art Unit: 2816

1

Claims 3-15 are indefinite because of the technical deficiencies of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 11, 14, 16, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamasaki (USP. 6,486,731).

Regarding claims 1 and 14, figure 1 of Yamasaki shows an integrated circuit means for delivering one output comprising means for generating main voltage (EX, not shown), means (RGF) for generating an internal reference (Vref). The voltage of the reference voltage (Vref) is inherently lower than the supply voltage (EX) of the circuit; means for connecting the main voltage on the output (2d) and means for detecting the voltage at the output (2b). The output voltage is equal to the reference voltage (col. 9. lines 18-23).

Regarding claims 3, 4 and 5, when the output signal is lower than the reference (Vref), the output of circuit (1) is low and the means of connecting (2d) starts to conduct until the output voltage (Vrfo) equals the reference voltage and the currents between the means of connecting (2d) and the means of detecting or limiting (2b, 2c) are balanced. The means of connecting comprises a first power transistor (2d). The connection of transistor (2d) is shown in figure 1. The reference voltage (vref) is used to supply other components of the integrated circuit (VDC).

Regarding claims 6 and 8, it is inherent that the limiting means (2b, 2c) comprises a second transistor having gate connected to the reference voltage (vref). When the predetermined voltage is reached, the circuit (2b, 2c) sends signal to "block" the first power transistor (2d).

Regarding claim 11, the gate of the first power transistor (2d) is connected to a command input (TE) via a fourth transistor (2e).

Art Unit: 2816

Regarding claim 16, figure 1 of Yamasaki shows communication module for an integrated circuit meant for delivering one output comprising means for generating main voltage (EX, not shown), means for generating an internal reference (RFG). The voltage of the reference voltage (Vref) is inherently lower than the supply voltage (EX) of the circuit; means for connecting the main voltage on the output (2d) and means (2b) for limiting the voltage on the output. The output voltage is equal to the reference voltage (col. 9. lines 18-23).

Regarding claims 22 and 23, figure 1 of Yamasaki shows communication module for an integrated circuit meant for delivering one output comprising means for generating main voltage (EX, not shown), means for generating an internal reference (RFG) and the voltage of the reference voltage (Vref) is inherently lower than the supply voltage (EX) of the circuit; means for connecting the main voltage on the output (2d) and means (2b) for limiting the voltage on the output. The output voltage is equal to the reference voltage (col. 9. lines 18-23). It is inherent that the reference voltage (vref) is used to supply other components of the integrated circuit (VDC). It is inherent that an input (gate) of a transistor of comparator (2b) is controlled by the reference voltage (Vref).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamasaki (USP. 6,486,731).

Regarding claims 13 the recitations "logic "1" of a USB connection" and is merely intended use thus, they do not further limit the limitations of the claims. It has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed

Art Unit: 2816

structural limitations. Ex Parte Masham, 2 USPQ F.2d 1647 (1987). Therefore, these limitations have not been given patentable weight.

Regarding claim 15, figure 1 of Yamasaki includes all the limitations of claim 15 except for the limitation that the predetermined voltage has a value of 3V and the main voltage has a value of 5V. However, the particular values of the predetermined voltage and the main voltage recited by the Applicant are considered to be design expedient depending upon a particular environment or an application in which the circuit of Yamasaki is to be used. Lacking of showing any criticality, a skilled artisan would be motivated to select the predetermined voltage having a value of 3V and the main voltage having a value of 5V for conforming to the power requirement of the components of the integrated circuit. Thus, the limitation of having predetermined voltage with a value of 3V and the main voltage with a value of 5V will not be patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7, 9, 10, 12 and 21 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 7 would be allowable because the prior art of records (USP 6,486, 731) fails to teach or suggest an integrated circuit in that the gate of the second transistor is connected to the gate of a third diode connected transistor.

Claims 9, 10 and 12 would be allowable because the prior art of records (USP 6,486, 731) fails to teach or suggest an integrated circuit comprises a blocking means having first and second current mirror as called for in claim 9.

Claim 21would be allowable because the prior art of records (USP 6,486, 731) fails to teach or suggest an integrated circuit comprises a blocking means having first and second current mirrors connected to each other.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2816

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hiep Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1752. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Callahan can be reached on (571) 272-1740. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hiep Nguyen

10-05-05

TUANT.LAM

Page 6